



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10/04/2023

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN
CRL OP(MD) . No.6483 of 2023

WEB COPY

1. Malar @ Malar Vizhi

2. Meha ... Petitioners / Accused No.2 & 3

Vs

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Chinnalapatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.46/2023.)

... Respondent / Complainant

For Petitioner : M/s. Anand R., Advocate.

For Intervenor : M/s.R.Saravanakumar, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.B.Thanga Aravindh,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.438 of Cr.P.C

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 46/2023 on the file of the Respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A2 and A3 who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under sections 341,294(b),33,109,307 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No. 46 of 2023 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the father of the defacto complainant said to have extra marital affair with the second petitioner. The father of the defacto complainant after serving as a Vice Chancellor in a university has attained superannuation six years back and settled with the family of the defacto complainant. Hence often the petitioners demanded share in the property. Be that as it may the second petitioner had married A1 and started to give pressure for obtaining share in the property. While on 30.03.2023 at about 9.00 pm., when the defacto complainant was returning back to the house after visiting his father four persons came in a two wheeler, intercepted the two wheeler



abused him in filthy language and also attacked him with, hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the first petitioner had illegal intimacy with the father of the defacto complainant. There exist property dispute due to which there was a quarrel and utilizing the said circumstances now a false complaint has been foisted as against the petitioner. Even according to the case of prosecution they were not present in the place of occurrence and they are no way connected with the alleged occurrence, hence he seek bail.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record including the First Information Report.

5. There are totally seven accused in this case and the petitioners herein are arrayed as A2 and A3. The first accused is the husband of the second petitioner herein, who is a notorious rowdy element. He along with other accused planned to do away the life of the victim, therefore they all conspired together and attacked the injured, due to which he sustained grave injuries on the entire body, taken to hospital and even still today he is taking treatment as inpatient in the hospital, hence this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. In the result, the petition stand dismissed.

sd/-
10/04/2023

/ TRUE COPY /

/04/2023
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

AAV

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Chinnalapatti Police Station,
Dindigul District.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.6483 of 2023
Date :10/04/2023

ED/VR/SAR- 4(13/04/2023) 2P 3C

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>